## Appendix to the State Water Board's CEQA Regulations, 23 CCR §§ 3720-3782

### **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

## 1. Project Title

An amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Colorado River Basin Region to Revise Indicator Bacteria for the Coachella Valley Storm Water

## 2. Lead Agency Name and Address

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Colorado River Basin Region, 73720 Fred Waring Dr. Ste. 100, Palm Desert, California, 92260

#### 3. Contact Person and Phone Number

Joan Stormo, Region 7 (760) 346-7491

## 4. Project location:

The Coachella Valley Storm Channel passes through the Counties of Riverside and Imperial, in the southern part of California. The Coachella Valley is bounded to the north by the San Bernardino and Little San Bernardino Mountains, and to the south by the San Jacinto and Santa Rosa Mountains, and the Salton Sea. This amendment applies only to a 17-mile section of the channel, beginning in the City of Coachella just west of Dillon Road at the outlet of the Valley Sanitary Waste Water Treatment Facility, and terminating at the northern shore of the Salton Sea.

### 5. Description of Project:

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Colorado River Basin Region (hereinafter referred to as the Regional Water Board) is the Lead Agency for evaluating the environmental impacts of the proposed amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Colorado River Basin Region (Basin Plan), to replace the current water quality objectives (WQO) for fecal coliforms and enterococcus, with WQO's for E. coli, effectively designating E. coli as the sole indicator bacteria used for detecting the presence of pathogens. The Secretary of Resources has certified the basin planning process as exempt from certain requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including preparation of an initial study, a negative declaration and environmental impact report [Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Section 15251(g)]. As this proposed amendment to the Basin Plan is part of the basin planning process, the amendment is considered 'functionally equivalent' to an initial study, a negative declaration and an environmental impact report. Any regulatory program of the Regional Water Board certified as functionally equivalent, however, must satisfy the documentation requirements of Title 23, California Code of Regulations, Section 3777(a), which requires an Environmental Checklist with a description of the proposed activity, and a determination with respect to significant environmental impacts. This information is presented herein.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <u>AESTHETICS</u> – Would the project:		oo.po.a.oa		
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act contract?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				
III. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon the make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				$\boxtimes$
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				
IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy ordinance?				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				

V. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> -- Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
VI. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
iv) Landslides?				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?  VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS				
MATERIALS Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
d) Be located on a site included with hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and result in a significant hazard to the public or environment?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				
VIII. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER</u> <u>QUALITY</u> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support the existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				
X. <u>MINERAL RESOURCES</u> Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				
XI. NOISE Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
XII. <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING</u> Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES –				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?				
Police protection?				
Schools?				
Parks?			Ц	
Other public facilities?				$\boxtimes$
XIV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion or recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				
XVI. <u>UTILITIES AND SERVICE</u> <u>SYSTEMS</u> Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)?				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of making impact determinations, potential impacts were determined to be significant if the Proposed Project or its alternatives would result in changes in environmental conditions that would, either directly or indirectly, cause a substantial loss of habitat or substantial degradation of water quality or other resources.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

Each resource category of the Environmental Checklist is supported by the following discussions and source information, as cited.

#### **Aesthetics**

The Coachella Valley Storm Channel is not sensitive with respect to scenic vistas, and the proposed project will not impose any visual alteration to the Storm Channel. Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The presence of indicator bacteria in a water body indicates the likely presence of pathogens, which is often a result of fecal contamination. The Proposed Project would establish E. coli as the sole indicator bacterium for a 17-mile stretch of the Coachella Valley Storm Water Channel. Because E. coli is more specifically intestinal in origin, it is considered to be a more reliable indicator of fecal contamination in recreational waters. Therefore, E. coli is considered superior to the current indicator for protecting public health against gastro-intestinal illness. The project should result in no impact to aesthetics.

## Agricultural Resources

The proposed project will clarify confusing language in the Basin Plan, which staff anticipates may help agricultural dischargers in complying with water quality regulations.

## Air Quality

The Proposed Project would establish E. coli as the sole indicator bacterium for a 17-mile section of the Coachella Valley Storm Water Channel. The project should result in no impact to air quality.

## Biological Resources

Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The project should result in no impact to biological resources.

#### Cultural Resources

The Proposed Project would establish E. coli as the sole indicator bacterium for a 17-mile section of the Coachella Valley Storm Water Channel. The project should result in no impact to cultural resources.

## Geology and Soils

Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The project should result in no impact to geology and soils.

#### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The project should result in no impact with regard to hazards and hazardous materials.

# Hydrology and Water Quality

The presence of fecal coliforms in a water body may sometimes indicate an impact to water quality that is not necessarily fecal in origin, however, this holds true for water bodies that receive wastes from industrial discharges, such as pulp and paper mills. Currently, there are no industries of this nature that discharge into the Coachella Valley Storm Water Channel. Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The presence of indicator bacteria in a water body indicates the likely presence of pathogens, which is most often a result of fecal contamination. E. coli is considered superior to the current indicator for protecting public health against gastro-intestinal illness. The project should result in no impact to hydrology and water quality.

#### Mineral Resources

Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The project should result in no impact to mineral resources.

#### Noise

Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The project should result in no impact to noise.

## Population and Housing

Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The project should result in no impact to population and housing.

#### Public Services

Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The project should result in no impact to public services.

#### Recreation

Although recreation in and around the channel is both illegal and discouraged, human contact with the water in the channel is still possible. Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The presence of indicator bacteria in a water body indicates the likely presence of pathogens, which is most

often a result of fecal contamination. The Proposed Project would establish E. coli as the sole indicator bacterium for a 17-mile section of the Coachella Valley Storm Water Channel. This section of the channel is private property, and although recreation within the channel is prohibited, the water within the channel is accessible by the public. Because E. coli is more specifically intestinal in origin, it is considered to be a more reliable indicator of fecal contamination in recreational waters. Therefore, E. coli is considered superior to the current indicator for protecting public health against gastro-intestinal illness. The project is expected to have no impact on recreation.

# Transportation/Traffic

Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The project should result in no impact to transportation or traffic.

## **Utilities and Service Systems**

Indicator bacteria are monitored for the purpose of assessing water quality as it relates to human health. The project should not impact utilities and service systems.

#### THE NO PROJECT/CURRENT BASIN PLAN ALTERNATIVE

This Staff Report concludes that the Proposed Project will not cause any potentially significant impacts. Therefore, there are no mitigation measures or alternative that could reduce or avoid significant impacts. This report analyzes a No Project/Current Basin Plan Alternative to provide additional context for decision-making parties. The No Project/Current Basin Plan Alternative is not *environmentally* superior to the Proposed Project.

The No Project/Current Basin Plan Alternative characterizes what would happen if the Proposed Project (i.e., updating the bacteria objectives for recreational waters) is not approved and implemented. Under the No Project/Current Basin Plan Alternative, there will also be no impacts.

#### RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE

Based on the analysis of the Proposed Project and the No Project/Current Basin Plan Alternative presented above, the Regional Water Board staff recommends approval and implementation of the Proposed Project.

#### **DE MINIMUS FINDING**

The Regional Water Board, after consideration of the evidence, finds that the proposed project has no potential for adverse effect, either individually or cumulatively, on wildlife.

### PRELIMINARY STAFF DETERMINATION

The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and therefore, no alternatives or mitigation measures are proposed.

		and			
	therefore alternatives and mitigation measures have been evaluated.				